Technical Report

Babcock & Wilcox Canada
Cambridge Ontario

F184

Babcock & Wilcox Canada

"THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED AS AN ACCOUNT OF WORK SPONSORED BY A DEPARTMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. NEITHER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF CANADA NOR ANY AGENCY THEREOF, NOR ANY CONTRACTOR OR SUBCONTRACTOR, NOR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES, MAKES ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, OR ASSUMES ANY LEGAL LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY THIRD PARTY'S USE OF OR THE RESULTS OF SUCH USE OF ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, PRODUCT OR PROCESS DISCLOSED IN THIS REPORT, OR REPRESENTS THAT ITS USE BY SUCH THIRD PARTY WOULD NOT INFRINGE PRIVATELY OWNED RIGHTS".

COMPUTER AIDED DERATING ASSESSMENT OF OIL-DESIGNED TANGENTIALLY FIRED UTILITY BOILERS

FINAL REPORT

BY

BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA

BWC-TR-14-83

Work on this project was conducted under the auspices of the Canada Centre for Mineral and Energy Technology, Energy, Mines and Resources, Canada.

DSS FILE NUMBER	: 23SQ.23440-2-9057
DSS CONTRACT SERIAL NUMBER	: OSQ82-00129
CANMET PROJECT NUMBER	: 434251
CANMET SCIENTIFIC AUTHORITY	: DR. H. WHALEY

122 pp

MICROMEDIA

Babcock & Wilcox Canada

INDEX

		PAGE
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1-11
	1.1 Background	
	1.2 Effects of CWF Combustion on Oil Designed Boilers	
	1.3 Study Objectives & Limitations	
	1.4 Assumptions	
	1.4.1 Boiler	
	1.4.2 Fuel	
	1.4.3 Performance	
2.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	12-26
	2.1 "Box Type" Design	
	2.2 Pendant Panel Design	
	2.3 Deration Evaluation	
	2.4 Field Modifications	
	2.5 Auxiliary Equipment	
	2.6 Conclusions	
3.0	STUDY APPROACH	27-36
	3.1 General	
	3.1.1 Multiple Zone Furnace Model	
	3.1.2 Convection Pass Model	
	3.2 Oil Firing Performance	
	3.3 Pulverized Coal Firing Performance	
	3.4 CWF Firing Performance	
4.0	DESCRIPTION OF STUDY UNITS SELECTED.....	37-47
	4.1 General	
	4.2 "Box Type" Units	
	4.3 Pendant Panel Units	
5.0	FUELS	48-52
6.0	IMPORTANT BOILER PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS...	53-58

INDEX

		PAGE
7.0	BOILER LOAD DERATION TO FIRE COAL AND CWF	59-86
	7.1 General	
	7.2 Small "Box Type" Design	
	7.3 Large "Box Type" Design	
	7.4 Small "Pendant Panel" Design	
	7.5 Large "Pendant Panel" Design	
8.0	AUXILIARY EQUIPMENT CONSIDERATIONS	87-105
	8.1 Small Boiler Designs	
	8.1.1 Forced Draft Fans	
	8.1.2 Regenerative Air Preheaters	
	8.1.3 Sootblowers	
	8.2 Large Boiler Designs	
	8.2.1 Forced Draft Fans	
	8.2.2 Induced Draft Fans	
	8.23 Regenerative Air Preheaters	
	8.24 Sootblowers	
9.0	MODIFICATIONS TO REDUCE DERATIONS	106-109
	9.1 General	
	9.2 Small "Box Type" Design	
	9.3 Large "Box Type" Design	
	9.4 Small "Pendant Panel" Design	
	9.5 Large "Pendant Panel" Design	
10.0	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	110-118
	10.1 Boiler	
	1.02 Performance	
11.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY	119

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The search for alternatives to fuel oil has led to the development of coal/oil mixture and coal/water slurry fuels. The coal/water fuels have the attractive feature of totally eliminating oil as a main fuel, but the unit derations resulting from their use in oil capable boiler designs may limit their viability. A recent study conducted by the Electric Power Research Institute [1], evaluated the economic retrofit potential of a number of boiler types to coal/oil mixture firing. The results of this study indicated that, in general, the cost savings to be realized (at 1981 oil prices) in a conversion from oil to coal/oil mixture firing, were expected to be marginal.

The promising aspects of coal/water slurries as fuels (CWF) led to an EPRI project [2], (No.1895), to develop and demonstrate a highly-loaded coal/water slurry (up to 70% coal by wt.) as a replacement for oil. This work was primarily concerned with developing and costing slurry production methods and establishing the ignition and combustion characteristics of coal/water slurries.

1.1 Backgound - Cont'd.

As the study of highly-loaded coal/water slurries progresses, increased attention is being focused upon detailed investigation of existing oil-designed utility steam generators for conversion to CWF. This study is part of a new initiative prompted by the 1980 Canadian National Energy Program.

Specifically, this study is aimed at evaluating typical tangentially fired oil capable designed Utility Boilers of the size and style found in Eastern Canada to determine the expected derating effects of CWF firing.

A second similar report addressing derating effects on oil capable wall fired Utility Boilers has been previously submitted.

1.2 Effects of CWF Combustion on Oil-Designed Boilers

As a result of coal's slower combustion kinetics and the presence of ash in coal, boilers designed for coal and CWF firing must be larger (with more open convective surface spacing) than those designed for oil. The following design features characterize a coal-designed boiler [3];

1. Relatively large furnace. This provides sufficient time during combustion to ensure good char burn-out and hence good efficiency of combustion. The furnace must also have adequate radiant heat transfer surface to promote cooling of the molten ash in the flue gas before it reaches the convection heat transfer surface at the furnace exit.

2. Ample burner spacing. Allowable heat input per burner is lower for coal firing necessitating the addition of more burner levels.

3. Wider convection surface spacing. Sufficient spacing must be provided to eliminate slag bridging and ensure reasonable gas velocities through the convective sections.

1.2 Effects of CWF Combustion on Oil-Designed Boilers - Cont'd.

4. Hopper bottom slope must be great enough to ensure ash and slag flow into ash pit as well as reduce the chance of damage to the pressure parts from slag falls. Hopper throat must be larger than an oil-designed unit to permit ash and slag to drop to ash pit.

5. Sootblowing capability in both the furnace and convection passes.

The presence of additional moisture in CWF will affect the boiler performance in a number of ways. The need to evaporate this additional moisture prior to combustion of the coal will reduce the flame temperature, decrease the unit's fuel efficiency and contribute to poorer ignition stability. These effects will require higher combustion air temperature,more fuel input for a given output,and burner equipment designed specifically to obtain flame stability and turndown on CWF.

1.2 Effects of CWF Combustion on Oil-Designed Boilers - Cont'd.

Firing pulverized coal or CWF will result in slag deposits on the furnace walls. Due to the relatively low thermal conductivity of this slag, the furnace wall tubes will be partially insulated. This results in decreased radiative furnace heat absorption, increased furnace exit gas temperature and increased convection pass heat absorption. This may result in steam temperature unbalances between secondary superheater and reheater (on units with reheat) and excessive spray quantities to control superheater steam temperature. In addition as absorptive patterns shift through the unit, metal temperatures in the superheater/reheater sections may increse.

The presence of ash in the flue gas resulting from firing P.C. or CWF will contribute to erosion and limit allowable flue gas velocities through convective surfaces.

CWF firing will produce flue gas flows slightly higher than those from P.C. firing as a result of reduced fuel efficiency. The above characteristics of CWF will result in deration of oil designed boilers.

1.3 Study Objectives & Limitations

The objective of this study was to determine the expected unit deration of Canadian oil-designed utility boilers to fire both P.C. and CWF. Two typical boiler styles, the "Box" style and the "Pendant Panel" style , were investigated. One large unit (1215 Mlbs/hr of steam) and one small unit (700 Mlbs/hr of steam) were analyzed for their expected derations to fire the following fuels;

i) high ash pulverized coal (8% ash)
ii) low ash pulverized coal (3% ash)
iii) high ash CWF (6.3% ash)
iv) low ash CWF (2.1% ash)

Although the results of this investigation reasonably predict the expected deration of typical Canadian oil-designed tangentially fired boilers, it must be stressed that a detailed site-specific deration study must be done before any decision is made concerning conversion of an existing boiler.

1.4 Assumptions

1.4.1 Boiler

1. Both the "Pendant Panel"and the "Box" style boilers represent typical corner firing designed boilers. It must be realized that the "Box" style boiler was developed primarily for oil and gas fired applications and, as such, will be an inherently "tighter" design than the Pendant Panel style, which is customarily used for PC firing. This is particularly true in the smaller unit sizes.

2. Both the Pendant Panel and the "Box" design control steam exit temperatures by using burner tilt modulation.

3. The unit deration calculations are based upon making no changes to the boiler pressure parts; although a qualitative assessment is made on the possible improvement in maximum attainable load if minor pressure part modifications were to be made.

4. No consideration has been given in this report to any implications on the boiler structural steel from conversion to CWF firing.

1.4.1 Boiler - Cont'd.

5. Necessary changes to handle ash resulting from CWF firing have not been considered.

6. The superheat/reheat control range assumed for designing the oil fired units was 100 to 60 percent.

7. The study was limited to consideration of the following equipment;

   i) boiler proper

   ii) fans

   iii) regenerative air preheaters

8. Burner zone heat release is regulated by maximum burner input and minimum spacing between burner buckets and will not be considered separately.

9. Although there is a maximum limit to burner inputs, this value can be varied by adjustment of burner size or spacing should it impose extreme load restriction on a given unit. Generally, plan area heat release will be more restrictive than burner input limits.

1.4.2 Fuel

1. It was assumed that slurrying would have no effect on the ash fusion temperature or slagging/fouling tendencies of ash chemistry of the parent coal.

2. It was further assumed that beneficiation of the coal would have no effect on the ultimate analysis of the coal ash during PC or CWF firing.

3. All study results are based upon fuels specified by CANMET and summarized in Section 5.0.

B&W and CANMET have agreed that the study should proceed based on the above assumptions. For further discussion refer to Section 6 of the report.

1.4.3 Performance

1. In view of the fact that there is little full scale operating data available on units firing CWF, the following parent PC design criteria has been used for CWF firing unit derations;

a) plan area heat release rate
b) furnace exit gas temperature
c) furnace volumetric liberation rate
d) flue gas velocity
e) allowable tube spacing vs. gas temperature
f) excess air quantities
g) surface cleanliness factors

Laboratory testing indicates some coal/water slurries have characteristics which vary greatly from parent P.C. (i.e. changed ash IDT, larger ash particle size etc.). The slurry used for the study is reported to have characteristics similar to its parent P.C. (5)

1.4.3 Performance - Cont'd.

2. Based upon past Babcock & Wilcox experience with firing coal/water slurries the minimum secondary air temperature for stable combustion with this particular CWF is expected to be approximately 500 deg.F.

3. It was assumed that reducing the ash content of the coal would greatly reduce the erosion potential of the resulting ash and therefore erosion barriers would not be necessary up to the flue gas velocity limit of 65 ft. per second. For high ash coal, erosion barriers were used for gas velocities between 50 and 65 ft. per second.

4. No consideration has been given to the effect of the atomizing medium (probably air) used during CWF firing on the performance of the units.

5. The unit performance for CWF firing was determined at the maximum attainable boiler loads. No part load performance for CWF firing was considered.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October 1982, B&W Canada contracted with the Dept. of Energy Mines and Resources through CANMET/CCRL to study the derating effect of firing high ash and low ash pulverized coal and coal/water slurry fuel (CWF) on oil capable tangentially fired boiler designs. This study was performed in parallel with a study of frontwall fired boilers. Two boiler styles and capacities were studied:

i) 60 MW (e) "Box Type" design
ii) 200 MW (e) "Box Type" design
iii) 60 MW (e) Pendant Panel design
iv) 200 MW (e) Pendant Panel design

An oil capable tangentially fired boiler was designed for each style and megawatt range. Section 3.0 describes B&W's computer aided detailed design approach.
The heating surface and furnace arrangements were designed to meet current allowable design limits. This approach was taken to produce a design which was not site specific and would be applicable to operating boilers.

The furnace size and absorption characteristics are the most difficult variables to model.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To verify our approach, identical B&W and CE units in the Maritimes were compared. These units were oil capable designs generating identical megawatt output. Our analysis indicates corner fired furnace absorptions to be equivalent to opposed wall fired boilers.

The following design criteria were reviewed for each boiler:

(a) plan area heat release rate
(b) furnace exit gas temperature
(c) furnace volumetric liberation rate
(d) flue gas velocity
(e) allowable tube spacing vs. gas temeprature
(f) excess air quantities
(g) surface cleanliness factors
(h) superheat/reheat steam temperatures

The maximum design limits for each of the above parameters are well established for oil, gas and pulverized coal. These limits are determined theoretically and from years of operating experience.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Cont'd

Since there is little full scale operating experience available on CWF, the present PC design limits were applied to the CWF for most parameters. Refer to Section 1.4.3 of the report for a detailed breakdown of the performance parameters.

The maximum attainable boiler loads for each boiler model for PC and CWF firing are summarized in Figures 2.1 to 2.4. The major boiler load limiting parameters were furnace exit gas temperature, flue gas velocity and flue gas temperature vs. tube side spacing. The unit deration calculations were based upon making no changes to the boiler pressure parts although a qualitative assessment is made on the possible improvement in maximum attainable load if pressure part modifications were to be made.

No consideration has been given in this report to changes to structural steel, ash handling fuel train, or boiler controls, required for the firing PC or CWF.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Cont'd.

The study was limited to consideration of the following;

i) boiler proper
ii) fans
iii) regenerative airheaters
iv) sootblowers

In order to fully understand the derating effect of each parameter, the design philosophy of each boiler style must be understood.

2.1 "Box Style" Design

The Box Style boiler design was developed primarily for oil and gas firing. The allowable flue gas velocities in the convection tube banks are much higher on oil and gas than on coal. It was, therefore, feasible to place all of the superheat, reheat, and economizer surface above the furnace within the same plan area as the furnace. The higher allowable velocities for oil and gas firing permit tight tube sidespacing, which increases heat transfer and reduces overall heating surface requirements.

2.1 Box Style Design - Cont'd

One of the major driving forces in any design is cost. For oil and gas firing, the EL Paso arrangement is very cost effective. However, convection surface adjustment for future PC or CWF firing is difficult due to the compact arrangement of superheat/reheat tube banks, and their wall support design. (Refer to Section 4, Fig. 4.2). It is obvious that there is little room for surface adjustment on this style of boiler.

2.2 Pendant Panel Design

When designing a boiler for coal firing, the allowable flue gas velocities and temperatures in the convection banks are lower than for oil and gas fired units. These limits are determined by analysing the quantity and composition of the ash in the coal, and determining its slagging and fouling potential (Refer to Section 5 for definition of slagging and fouling).

2.2 Pendant Panel Design - Cont'd...

Lower allowable velocities and temperatures reduces the heat transfer rates and requires the use of increased heating surface. The Pendant Panel style boiler was designed as an effective means of hanging large quantities of wide spaced heating surface above the furnace cavity. (Refer to Section 4, Fig. 4.4). The Box Type arrangement cannot easily accomodate this requirement since all of the convective heating surface is contained within the furnace plan area.

2.3 Deration Evaluation

Figures 2.1 to 2.4 identify the maximum derations of each unit when firing high ash and low ash PC, and high ash and low ash CWF. Fig.2.1 identifies the maximum deration and the design parameter which determine the deration level. Fig. 2.2 is a summary of the deration effects of gas velocity limits on each unit. Fig. 2.3 is a summary of the deration effects of FEGT limits on each unit. Fig. 2.4 is a summary of the deration effects of gas temperature vs. tube side spacing on each unit.

Section 7.0 describes in detail the deration parameters affecting each boiler size in order of priority.

2.3.1 Small Boiler Design

When considering Figure 2.1 it is noted that the small Box Type model is the most severely derated. The maximum attainable load of 35% on CWF firing is determined by the maximum allowable flue gas temperature leaving the furnace and entering the 9 inch sidespaced superheater banks. The Pendant Panel design for oil firing is more conservative than the Box Type design in the small boiler range. This conservatism is a function of furnace heating surface. The furnace dimensions on the small Pendant Panel Design are constrained by burner clearance requirements and not heat input. This makes the furnace exit gas temperature on oil firing 180°F lower on the small Pendant Panel Desig boiler compared to the small El Paso boiler. Consequently, the maximum attainable load on CWF on the small Pendant Panel boiler is 51%. This restriction is determined by the maximum allowable gas temperature entering the 4 inch spaced horizontal primary superheat banks in the downpass of the boiler.

2.3.2 Large Boiler Design

The Large Box Type design has a maximum allowable load of 55% on high ash CWF. This is a gas velocity restriction imposed by the primary superheater banks at the top of the downpass. Referring to Section 7, Fig. 7.7, the same restriction of 55% load is based on maximum allowable FEGT. The Large Pendant Panel boiler is severely restricted by gas temperature limitations entering the first bank of reheat tubes (42%). Referring to Fig. 7.15, the next restriction is 55% load based on maximum allowable FEGT.

When reviewing Figures 2.1 to 2.4, it must be emphasized that application of the deration results to existing boilers may not be valid due to site specific factors. Although there are standard maximum design parameters which must be adhered to for each boiler design, there is wide latitude regarding surface placement and spacing. In view of the fact that the large pendant panel design is derated severly by gas temperature vs. side spacing in the reheat banks. If the reheat banks had wider spacing, it would suffer approximately the same deration as the large Box Style design. Fig. 2.3 is perhaps the most accurate representation of the trend in deration for the four boiler styles studied.

2.3.2 Large Boiler Design - Cont'd.

The spacing and arrangement of convective heating surface can change this trend, as witnessed in this study (Fig. 2.1).

2.4 Field Modifications

A major concern when firing CWF is to limit the flue gas temperature entering the convective heat transfer surface to below the ash fusion temperature. One method of achieving this is to limit heat input to the furnace, (i.e. derate the boiler). Some reduction in flue gas temperature can be acheived by the use of gas tempering at the furnace exit plane. This method is only a available on units with gas recirculation fans. The installation of additional furnace heating surface (wingwalls) is another method available for reduction of furnace exit gas temperatures.

The most effective means of increasing furnace absorption and reducing furnace exit temperatures is to tilt the burners downward. This will increase unit output while maintaining constant F.E.G.T.Unit derations would be reduced accordingly. If the load limiting performance criteria is flue gas velocity, or

2.4 Field Modifications Cont'd.

gas temperature vs. side spacing, the tube spacing can be altered by removing alternate tube rows or replacing entire banks of tubes. Section 9 of the report address each unit in detail.

2.5 Auxiliary Equipment

In all cases, firing PC or CWF requires the use of an ID Fan. On the small unit designs this will require the addition of required gas flues and fan. The oil capable FD fans would be suitable for derated firing of PC or CWF on all units studied.

The regenerative airheater on the small design Box Style and Pendant Panel boiler is suitable for PC and CWF firing. The airheater on the large boilers generates marginal air temperatures to the boiler. These units require the use of a steam coil airheater to increase air temperature and for cold end temperature corrosion protection.

All four units require the use of additional soot-blowers for firing PC or CWF. Refer to Section 8.0 for a detailed evaluation of auxiliary equipment performance.

2.6 Conclusions

The deration figures generated by this study are dependent on the fuel characteristics and boiler arrangements studied.

Laboratory testing has revealed variations in CWF properties depending on the type of slurrying agents used in its preparation. Each CWF designated for use in a boiler conversion should be analysed to determine its ash viscosity profile and ash fusion temperature. These values have a large influence on the amount of boiler deration required. Incorrect assumptions in this area could render any study meaningless.

In addition, each boiler design will have site specific factors which make it unique. The boiler in question may have a furnace size which is liberal or conservative. This also applies to convective surface arrangement and quantity of air preheater heating surface.

It is, therefore, necessary that a site specific study be performed on any boiler considered for conversion from oil to PC or CWF.

K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.


% MCR ATTAINABLE
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
55%
LARGE BOX TYPE LASH CWF FEGT
LARGE BOX TYPE HASH CWF FEGT
57%
LARGE BOX TYPE LASH PC FEGT
LARGE BOX TYPE HASH PC FEGT
42%
LARGE PEND. PLATEN LASH CWF GAS TEMP VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN HASH CWF GAS TEMP VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN LASH PC GAS TEMP. VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN HASH PC GAS TEMP. VS. SPCG.
35%
SMALL BOX TYPE LASH CWF FEGT
SMALL BOX TYPE HASH CWF FEGT
36%
SMALL BOX TYPE LASH PC FEGT
SMALL BOX TYPE HASH PC FEGT
51%
SMALL PEND. PLATEN LASH CWF GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN HASH CWF GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN LASH PC GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN HASH PC GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
LASH = LOW HASH
HASH = HIGH ASH

FIGURE 2.1 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOADS VS MAJOR DERATING VARIABLE FIRING P-C & C.W.F.

K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

46 1323



FIGURE 7.2 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS. GAS VELOCITY FIRING - P.C & C WF

K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

46 1323



FIGURE 2.3 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS FEGT FIRING P.C & C.W.F.



FIGURE 2.4 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS GAS TEMP/SIDE SPACING FIRING PC & CWF

3.0 STUDY APPROACH

3.1 General

Four oil-fired units were selected that represent typical tangentially fired Pendant Panel and Box style boilers for 700,000 and 1,215,000 lb/hr steam flow capability. The full load steam conditions used are shown in Table 3.1

In the performance analysis of these boilers for the different fuels (oil, pulverized coal, and coal/water slurry) two computer models developed by B&W were used; the multiple zone furnace model and the convection pass model. Experience gained during coal/water slurry investigations at the B&W Alliance Research Centre and literature published by other researchers was used to establish performance parameter limits for CWF firing.

Heat transfer in a boiler is extremely complex since all principal mechanisms of heat transfer occur simultaneously. The computer model must account for intersolid radiation between solid particles in suspension and tubes and refractory materials; non-luminous gas radiation from combustion products, convection from the furnace gases to the tube banks, and conduction through ash deposits on tubes.

3.1 General - Cont'd.

Babcock & Wilcox has developed computer models to combine these mechanisms with empirical data compiled from operating experience; both for the furnace zone and the convection pass.

	Small Unit	Large Unit	Units
Secondary Superheater Outlet			
- Flow	700	1215	Mlbs/hr.
- Pressure	1313	1959	PSIG
- Temperature	960	1005	$^{o}_{F}$
Reheat Outlet			
- Flow	-	1035	Mlbs/hr.
- Pressure	-	376	PSIG
- Temperature	-	1005	$^{o}_{F}$
Feedwater			
- Flow	700	1276	Mlbs/hr.
- Pressure	1445	2115	PSIG
- Temperature	440	446	$^{o}_{F}$
Drum Operating Pressure	1428	2084	PSIG

Table 3.1: Steam Conditons

3.1.1 Multiple Zone Furnace Model

This computer model performs combustion calculations. Based on a known boiler output, the unit efficiency and total input is determined. Using this data the computer calculates the furnace exit gas temperature. The results of these calculations provide the inputs necessary for the convection pass model.

In determining furnace absorption rates (for detailed furnace exit gas temperature calculations) the model uses a combined variable emissivity that is based on the partial pressure of CO_2 and H_2O, flame luminosity and wall emissivity. In order to obtain an overall heat balance within the furnace, an emissivity correction factor (FQ1) is used. This correction factor is based, in part, upon the fact that a distribution of temperatures and gas compositions occurs in each zone of the furnace. Wall emissivity will also vary depending on slagging characteristics of the coal. The application of the emissivity correction factor is shown in the following equation:

3.1.1 Multiple Zone Furnace Model - Cont'd.

$$e_z = FQ1 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{eg} + \frac{1}{ew} - 1}$$

Where:

e_z = emissivity of any zone

eg = theoretical emissivity of the gas based on the concentration of CO_2 and H_2O.

ew = emissivity of the walls

FQ1 = emissivity correction factor

The emissivity of CO_2 and H_2O curves are a function of radiating length, which is a volume/area relationship.

Thus, this procedure has the capability of accounting for the effect of changes in geometry for different sizes and shapes of combustors.

3.1.2 Convection Pass Model

The convection pass performance program can calculate heat transfer performance, select critical superheater tube materials, economically group materials and calculate cold fluid superheater and reheater pressure drop for a coal, oil or natural gas designed boiler with series or divided flow gas paths, series or parallel flow steam paths, and single or double stage primary superheaters.

While the actual model and heat transfer calculations are complex, the mathematical explanation for evaluating surface effectiveness or cleanliness can best be described with the following basic heat transfer quotation for a tube bank:

$$Q = U \times A \times \Delta T \times K_f \text{ , Btu/Hr}$$

Where: Q = Heat absorbed by a tube bank (s), BTU/hr

U = Theoretical overall conductance between the gas and steam (water) for normally clean surfaces, Btu/ft.^{2} - hr - ^oF

A = Surface area of the tube bank, ft^2

3.1.2 Convection Pass Model - Cont'd.

ΔT = Log mean temperature difference between the gas and steam (water) entering and leaving the bank, ^{o}F

K_f = Surface effectiveness or cleanliness factor (variable)

The area is fixed. The parameters Q,U, and ΔT can be measured or calculated. The K_f factor is the correction between what the heat absorption should be with normally clean surfaces (U x A x ΔT) and what was actually measured (Q). Empirical data provides high prediction accuracy due to the fact that all of the measured variables are items routinely measured with a high degree of reliability without any need for special instrumentation.

3.2 Oil - Firing Performance

1. The B&W furnace performance model was used to establish thermal efficiency, flue gas weight, flue gas composition, furnace exit gas temperature, combustion air requirements and fuel requirements on oil-firing for all four units. This full load performance on oil was used as the maximum unit capability for subsequent calculations on unit deration.

3.2 Oil - Firing Performance - Cont'd.

2. The B&W convection pass model was then used to establish the following, for each unit:
   - bank heat absorptions
   - flue gas temperatures
   - steam (water) temperatures
   - tube metal temperatures
   - flue gas velocities
   - spray water requirements

3.3 Pulverized Coal-Firing Performance

1. Both the high and low ash coals were investigated and maximum boiler design parameters were determined per B&W Standards.

2. Using the B&W furnace model the discrete boiler deration, resulting from application of each maximum design parameter, was determined for all four boilers firing both high and low ash PC.

3. The B&W convection pass model was run for each of the maximum attainable loads on each unit.

3.3 Pulverized Coal-Firing Performance - Cont'd.

4. A qualitative assessment of each unit was performed to determine the equipment modifications necessary to fire pulverized coal.

5. A qualitative assessment of each unit was performed to indicate pressure part changes that could conceivably reduce the unit deration on PC firing.

3.4 CWF Firing Performance

1. Both the high and low ash CWF's were investigated and maximum boiler design parameters were determined based primarily on the performance indices of the parent coal.

2. Calculations were undertaken to determine the expected reduction if flame temperature between each PC fuel and CWF, due to the presence of additional moisture.

3. Using the B&W furnace model the discrete boiler deration, resulting from application of each maximum design parameter, was determined for all four boilers firing both high and low ash CWF.

3.4 CWF Firing Performance - Cont'd.

4. The B&W convection pass model was run for each of the maximum attainable loads on each unit.

5. Calculations were then performed to determine the necessary changes in auxiliary equipment (such as regenerative air preheaters, fans,etc.) in order to achieve the maximum attainable boiler load for each unit. These calculations were performed for both high and low ash fuels.

6. A qualitative assessment of each unit was performed to indicate pressure part changes that could conceivably reduce the unit deration on CWF firing.

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF STUDY UNITS SELECTED

4.1 General

Two very different boiler styles were used in this study; the Box Style design and the Pendant Panel design. The Box Style design is characterized by a horizontal arrangement of all heating surfaces, which can be drained by gravity through drain connections. The Pendant Panel design, on the other hand, has non-drainable heating surface platens located in the high flue gas temperature regions in the upper furnace and in the crossover section; while the surface located in the vertical down-pass section is normally all drainable horizontal surface. Four units were developed for analysis, a small and large unit of each boiler type. Care was taken in developing these units to avoid any site-specific design details.

4.2 Box Style Units

The small Box style unit developed is shown in Figure 4.1. The surface is arranged with secondary and primary superheat in the up-pass and economizer in the down-pass. The superheated steam exit temperature is controlled by a single-stage of attemperation. The unit is corner fired with 2 levels of oil burners as illustrated.

A physical summary of this unit is given in Table 4.1.

The large Box Type design is shown in Figure 4.2. The heating surface is arranged with reheat and secondary superheat surface in the up-pass and primary superheat and economizer in the down-pass. The superheat steam exit temperature is controlled by attemperation. Burner tilt modulation is used to maintain reheat steam exit temperature at reduced boiler loads. This unit is corner fired with twelve oil-burners arranged in three levels. A physical summary of this unit is given in Table 4.2.

REV.	DESCRIPTION	LOC.	BY	DATE	A





FIG. 4.1 SMALL BOX TYPE DESIGN

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD. AND IS LOANED ON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF [redacted] AND IS LOANED UPON THE [redacted]

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 700 MLB/HR CORNER FIRED RADIANT BOX TYPE BLR

CUSTOMER DSSC COAL/WATER FUEL - DERATING STUDY

DRAWN [redacted] CH'K [redacted] APP [redacted] 5/6/93 74%

SCALE [redacted] DA [redacted]

DWG. NO. [redacted] 805 [redacted] REV. [redacted] 0 [redacted] 51

Table 4.1 Physical Summary of Small Box Type Design

Furnace Width	24 ft.
Furnace Depth	23 ft.
Furnace Height	
- Centre-line of lower wall header to drum centre	74.0
No. of burners	9
Hopper slope	30°
Hopper throat	2 ft.
Convection surface side spacing (on centres)	
- secondary superheat	9 inches
- primary superheat	6 inches
- economizer	3 inches

REV.	DESCRIPTION	LOC.	BY	DATE	APP

FIG. 4.2 LARGE BOX TYPE DESIGN





THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND IS LOANED ON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND WILL BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 200 M/W "CORLEW FIELD" RADIANT BOX TYPE BOILER

CUSTOMER O.S.S.C ~ DERATING STUDY

DRAWN PHYOE CH'K APP. C/C-73 7470 REV

SCALE DATE MAR 23/83 NO. 302250 0

Jo. 302250 REV. 0

E 19125J

4 3 2 1 A2

Table 4.2: Physical Summary of Large Box Style Design

Furnace width	30 ft.
Furnace depth	28 ft. 6 inches
Furnace height	
- centre-line of lower wall header to drum centre	123 ft.
No. of burners	12
Hopper slope	30^{o}
Hopper throat	2 ft.
Convection surface side spacing (on centres)	
- reheat	18 and 6 inches
- secondary superheat	18 and 6 inches
- primary superheat	6 and 4 inches
- economizer	4 inches

4.3 Pendant Panel

The small Pendant Panel style unit developed is shown in Figure 4.3. The surface is arranged with pendant superheat surface in the upper furnace and crossover section and horizontal primary superheat and economizer in the downpass. The superheated steam exit temperature is controlled by a single-stage of attemperation. The unit is corner fired with eight oil burners arranged in two levels. A physical summary of this unit is given in Table 4.3.

The large Pendant Panel design is shown in Figure 4.4. The heating surface is arranged with pendant secondary superheat and reheat in the upper furnace and cross-over section and horizontal primary superheat and economizer in the downpass. The superheat steam exit temperature is controlled by attemperation. Burner tilts are used to maintain reheat steam exit temperature at reduced loads. This unit is corner fired with twelve oil burners arranged in three levels. A physical summary of this unit is given in Table 4.4.

FIG. 4.3 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN



SECTION "A-A"



SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

D. 300252

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA (BABCOCK & WILCOX INDUSTRIES LTD.) AND IS LOANED UPON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS, OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA, AND IS TO BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST.
DO NOT SCALE - USE DIMENSIONS ONLY

REV.	PARTICULARS	LOC'N	DATE	CH'K

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 700 MLB/HR CORNER FIRED RAD PEND PANEL BLR

INDEXED D.S.S.C. OPERATING STUDY BY

DRAWN TT TR. CH'K FIRST ORDER 693-7470

SCALE ~ DATE APRIL 15/83 NO. 302252 REV. O APP. T

Table 4.3: Physical Summary of Small Pendant Panel Design

Furnace width	24 ft.
Furnace depth	23 ft.
Furnace height	
- Centre-line of lower wall header to drum centre	74 ft. 8 inches
No. of burners	8
Hopper slope	55°
Hopper throat	3 ft.
Convection surface side spacing (On centres)	
- Secondary superheat	18 and 9 inches
- primary superheat	4 inches
- economizer	2 ½ inches

REV.	DESCRIPTION	LOC	BY	DATE	APP



SECTION 'A-A'



SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

FIG. 4.4 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN

·46·

No.	3 0 2 2 4 9	REV. 01

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND IS LOANED ON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND WILL BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 200 M/W 'CORNER FIRED' RADIANT PENDANT PANEL ELR.

CUSTOMER D.S.S.C. - DERATING STUDY

DRAWN P.T.O.R. CH'K. APP. C/G93 7470

SCALE 1:12 DATE NO. 3 0 2 2 4 9 REV. 01

4 3 2 1

Table 4.4: Physical Summary of Large Pendant Panel Design

Furnace Width	30 ft.
Furnace Depth	28 ft. 6 inches
Furnace Height	
- Centre-line of lower wall header to drum centre	92 ft.
No. of burners	12
Hopper slope	55°
Hopper throat	3 ft.
Convection surface side spacing (on centres)	
- secondary superheat	18 and 9 inches
- reheat	4 ½ inches
- primary superheat	4 inches
- economizer	2 ½ inches

5.0 FUELS

The fuel analysis used for heavy oil, parent pulverized coal and resulting coal/water slurries are given in Table 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 respectively. Based on consultation with Canmet and Carbogel it was agreed that;

i) no change will occur in the slagging/fouling potential of the CWF compared with the parent pulverized coal.

ii) no change will occur in the ultimate analysis of the coal ash as a result of beneficiation

iii) no change will occur in ash fusion temperature of the CWF compared with the parent pulverized coal.

The pulverized coal and its resulting coal/water slurry were classified as having high/severe slagging and medium fouling tendencies, according to B&W index definitions.

Slagging is defined as ash deposition on furnace surface or convection surface exposed to radiant heat or where ash deposits remain molten.

5.0 FUELS - Cont'd.

Fouling is defined as ash deposition on convection surface not exposed to radiant heat and may be formed by impaction or chemical bonding or both.

Table 5.1: Heavy Fuel Oil Details

Ultimate Analysis (as fired)

Carbon	87.87%
Hydrogen	10.33%
Sulphur	1.16%
Oxygen	0.50%
Nitrogen	0.14%
	100 %

Heating Value

HHV = 18400 BTU/lb

Babcock & Wilcox Canada

Table 5.2: Pulverized Coal Details

	High Ash	Low Ash
Ultimate Analysis (as fired % by wt)		
Carbon	66.20	70.30
Hydrogen	4.42	4.69
Sulphur	3.31	3.51
Nitrogen	1.26	1.34
Oxygen	6.74	7.16
Ash	8.07	3.00
Moisture	10.00	10.00
	100	100
Heating Value		
HHV	12000 BTU/lb.	12800 BTU/lb.
Ash Analysis (dry - % by wt)		
SiO_2	32.54	32.54
Fe_2O_3	39.42	39.42
P_2O_3	0.08	0.08
MgO	0.82	0.82
Na_2O	0.59	0.59
Al_2O_3	20.44	20.44
TiO_2	0.80	0.80
CaO	1.64	1.64
SO_3	0.95	0.95
K_2O	1.14	1.14
Ash Fusibility		
Initial Deformation	2490 F(Oxid)	2490 F(Oxid)
	2000 F(red)	2000 F(red)

Table 5.3: Coal/Water Slurry Details

Ultimate Analysis (as-fired % by wt)	High Ash	Low Ash
Carbon	51.49	54.86
Hydrogen	3.44	3.66
Sulphur	2.58	2.74
Nitrogen	0.98	1.04
Oxygen	5.23	5.60
Ash	6.28	2.10
Moisture	30.00	30.00
	100	100
Heating Value		
HHV	9323 BTU/lb.	9928 BTU/lb.
Ash Analysis (dry % by wt.)		
SiO_2	32.54	32.54
Fe_2O_3	39.42	39.42
P_2O_3	0.08	0.08
MgO	0.82	0.82
Na_2O	0.59	0.59
Al_2O_3	20.44	20.44
TiO_2	0.80	0.80
CaO	1.64	1.64
SO_3	0.95	0.95
K_2O	1.14	1.14
Ash Fusibility		
Initial Deformation	2490 F(oxid)	2490 F(Oxid)
	2000 F(red)	2000 F(red)

6.0 IMPORTANT BOILER PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS

In determining the expected derations to fire various fuels in the oil-designed units, a number of key boiler performance parameters must be revised. Figure 6.1 illustrates the method of calculating some of these parameters.

Plan Area Release Rate

The purpose of this limit is to minimize lower furnace slagging and to avoid excessive fly-ash carryover from the furnace. This limitation is directly related to the slagging classification and expected reactivity of the coal. For this study the limit for the parent PC was used for CWF firing deration calculations.

6.0

Furnace Liberation Rate and Furnace Exit Gas Temperature

These two limits are related and the overall size of the furnace limits the maximum allowable load:

i) for acceptable FEGT to the convection pass consistent with the ash characteristics.

ii) to ensure sufficient volume is available for complete combustion in the furnace.

Ideally, the furnace box must be large enough to permit the furnace gas and ash particles to cool below the Initital Deformation Temperature of the ash. Volatile coal ash constituents, if allowed to condense on fly ash particles and deposit on boiler tubes in areas where the temperatures are in a range where constituents remain liquid, will react chemically with the fly ash, other deposits and the flue gas to form bonded deposits. This fouling phenomenon limits the allowable furnace exit gas temperature and is very dependent on the coal ash analysis characteristics.

6.0

Furnace Liberation Rate and Furnace Exit Gas Temperature - Cont'd.

It is known that some coal/water slurries exhibit a reduction in the IDT and a corresponding increase in the sodium content of the fuel ash versus the parent coal [4]. Some slurry manufacturers claim no adverse effects on ash properties result from their process. Carbogel advise that their slurry "contains extremely little, if any, of the elements which might affect ash properties or influence the fouling potential of the fuel"[5]. As previously mentioned no changes in ash properties are accounted for in this study. Many slurry manufacturers are switching from sodium based additives to ammonia base to eliminate any possible effects on CWS slagging/ fouling potential. For this study the limits used for furnace exit temperature and furnace liberation are the same on CWF as parent PC.

Convection Pass Maximum Gas Velocity

Metal loss due to erosion is proportional to the total ash quantity passing through the boiler and an exponential function of flue gas velocity. Since the total ash is fixed, for a given fuel, limiting flue gas velocities to acceptable levels is the method used to ensure minimal erosion.

6.0

Convection Pass Maximum Gas Velocity - Cont'd.

Flue gas velocities in the neighbourhood of 100-125 ft. per second are permitted on oil firing without the need for erosion barriers. For pulverized coal fuel with a relatively high ash content and indicated high erosion potential (high silica or alumina content) the flue gas velocity is allowed to reach 50 ft. per second before erosion barriers are necessary; maximum allowable velocity on coal is 65 ft. per second with erosion barriers. Erosion barriers are placed at the ends of horizontal tube banks to protect the tube bends from the erosive effects of local high gas velocities caused by gas laning. These erosion barriers reduce the overall available gas free flow area and result in higher average gas velocities for a given flue gas mass flow. For pulverized-coal fuel with a relatively low ash content and a low erosion potential, the flue gas velocity limit may be at 65 ft. per second without the need for erosion barriers.

In CWF firing the total ash produced will be approximately the same as for PC firing but the ash concentration in the flue gas will be somewhat reduced because of the increase in flue gas weight. Pulverized coal velocity limits were used for determining the necessary unit derations for high ash and low ash CWF firing in this study.

6.0

Tube Side Spacing vs. Flue Gas Temperature

The transverse tube spacing for convective heating surface is maintained wide enough to reduce the fouling rate and prevent bridging of ash deposits between adjacent tube bundles.

This also provides sufficient gas free flow area to ensure acceptable flue gas velocities, thereby reducing erosion potential during coal-firing. The lower limit on transverse tube spacing is based on the need to permit effective penetration of the sootblowing jet. The design limits for pulverized coal were employed when considering CWF firing.

Figure 6.1 Furnace Performance Parameters

Furnace definitions.

Typical
Radiant Boiler



Plan Area Release Rate ..... $\left[\frac{\text{input in fuel - BTU/HR}}{\text{w.d - FT}^2}\right]$ ..... BTU/FT² HR

Furnace Release Rate.. $\left[\frac{\text{heat release}^{*}\ \text{BTU/HR}}{\text{furn.flat projected area- FT}^2}\right]$.... BTU/FT²HR.

Furnace Liberation ... $\left[\frac{\text{input in fuel -BTU/HR}}{\text{w.d.h.- FT}^3}\right]$ ..... BTU/FT³HR

* heat released and available from fuel and heated air.

7.0 BOILER LOAD DERATION TO FIRE COAL AND COAL/WATER SLURRY

7.1 General

All four units studied utilize tilting burners as a method of steam temperature control. This control technique controls heat absorption with the furnace and thus there is an effect on the furnace exit gas temperature and this effect will influence the deration of the units.

Firing coal/water slurry of 30 percent moisture will result in increased flue gas mass flow which will adversely affect erosion potential and increase heat absorption to the convection sections of the boiler.

Calculations reveal that adiabatic flame temperature during coal/water combustion will be in the neighbourhood of 220^{o}F lower than that of the parent pulverizer coal.

7.1 General - Cont'd.

This is caused by the latent heat of vaporization necessary to overcome the additonal moisture in the slurry fuel and results in a lower fuel efficiency. This results in more fuel, air, flue gas and a higher heat input rate for the same boiler output rate. Beneficiation of the coal will result in an improvement in fuel efficiency and an improvement in attainable loads on low ash PC and CWF firing. The amount of improvement is a function of the type of beneficiation process used and the corresponding change in slagging/fouling potential effected. Erosion barriers were incorporated on the downpass rear wall at the top of the horizontal banks where the gas velocity exceeded 50 fps during high ash coal or CWF firing. This results in additional unit deration due to flue gas velocity limitations. An investigation into the acceptability of the oil-designed tube metal selection for all units revealed that no metal upgrades would be necessary for any of the maximum attainable loads on CWF firing.

7.2 Small Box Style Design

Figures 7.1 to 7.4 illustrates the maximum attainable boiler load for PC and CWF firing for the oil-designed small Box Style unit. Each design parameter was considered independently and its effect on boiler capacity determined.

When designing a furnace, the Engineer selects the number of required burners based on the allowable heat imput per burner for a given fuel. Although it is conceivable that the conversion to PC or CWF firing may restrict load due to a lower allowable heat input per burner for these fuels, this deration should be minimal. Again, only a site specific investigation would reveal the significance of this factor.

The furnace heat liberation rate (BTU/CU.FT.HR.) limit results in a maximum boiler load of 65% for pulverized coal-firing and 63% for coal/water slurry-firing. The furnace volume is normally determined by allowable furnace exit gas temperature on oil-firing.

7.2 Small Box Style Design - Cont'd.

The resulting furnace, due to the differences in HHV, gas emissivities, flame temperature, furnace wall cleanliness and allowable furnace exit gas temperatures, is undersized for PC of CWF combustion. The slightly lower attainable load for coal/water slurry-firing is a result of the reduced boiler efficiency due to the need to evaporate the additional moisture added during slurrying.

The allowable gas velocity through the convective heating surface results in a different maximum attainable load for each fuel; as follows:

Fuel	Flue Gas Velocity Limited Max. Attainable Boiler Load
High ash PC	56%
Low ash PC	64%
High ash CWF	54%
Low ash CWF	63%

The reduced unit deration for the beneficiated fuel is primarily due to the elimination of erosion barriers as a result of the decrease in erosion potential of the ash.

7.2 Small Box Style Design-Cont'd.

This permits the full use of the convection pass free flow area and hence, results in lower flue gas velocities. Once again, the reduced efficiency of CWF firing results in slightly greater gas flow for a given heat input and consequently slightly more unit deration than the PC fuel.

The allowable flue gas temperature vs. tube side spacing results in the same unit deration as the allowable furnace exit gas temperature limit for this particular unit size and style. This is due to the relatively tight sidespacing of the convective heating surface at the furnace exit. the maximum allowable boiler load is limited to 36% on PC firing and 35% on CWF firing.

FIGURE 7.1 SMALL BOX STYLE DESIGN

MAX. ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS. PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR HIGH ASH P.C.



FIGURE 7.2 SMALL BOX STYLE DESIGN

MAX. ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS. PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR LOW ASH P.C.



FIGURE 7.3 SMALL BOX STYLE DESIGN
MAX. ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS. PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR HIGH ASH CWF



FIGURE 7.4 SMALL BOX STYLE DESIGN
MAX. ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD
VS. PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR LOWASH CWF



7.3 Large Box Style Design

Figures 7,5 to 7.8 illustrate the maximum attainable boiler load for PC and CWF firing for the oil-fired large Box Style unit.

Due to the increased slagging potential of PC and CWF, plan area heat release rate and furnace liberation rate, results in some limitation on maximum attainable boiler load. As before, the additional moisture contained in CWF results in reduced fuel efficiency and slightly lower attainable loads.

7.3 Large Box Style Design - Cont'd.

Max. Attainable Boiler Load

Fuel	PAHRR	Furn. Liberation
High Ash PC	97%	80%
Low Ash PC	97%	80%
High Ash CWF	94%	78%
Low Ash CWF	94%	78%

The tube side spacing of the first reheater bank limits the maximum attainable boiler load due to fouling limitations. This results in the same unit deration for the furnace exit gas temperature limit and gas temperature vs. tube side spacing limitation.

Satisfying these two performance limits results in a maximum attainable boiler load of 57% for PC firing and 55% for CWF firing.

7.3 Large Box Style Design - Cont'd.

The flue gas velocity entering the first primary superheater bank in the downpass severely limits the attainable boiler load during firing of high ash PC and CWF. This is a result of the need for erosion barriers on the rear wall to combat the expected tube erosion during high ash fuel firing. The following loads are attainable on gas velocity limitations:

Fuel	Flue Gas Velocity Limited Max.Attainable Boiler Load
High Ash PC	57%
Low Ash PC	63%
High Ash CWF	55%
Low Ash CWF	61%

FIGURE 7.5 LARGE BOX STYLE DESIGN
MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD IS.
PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR HIGH ASH P.C.





FIGURE 7.6 LARGE BOX STYLE DESIGN MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS. PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR LASH P.C.

46 1323
K+E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO.

46 1323
K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

FIGURE 7.7 LARGE BOX STYLE DESIGN
MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS.
PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR HASH CWF





46 1323
K&E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO MADE IN U.S.A.

7.2 Small Pendant Panel Design

Figures 7.9 to 7.12 illustrate the maximum attainable boiler load for PC and CWF firing for the oil designed small Pendant Panel Style unit.

The Pendant Panel Style design results in a relatively liberal furnace volume and consequently the unit deration to fire PC and CWF is minimal due to furnace volumetric heat liberation rate and plan area heat release rate limits. The maximum attainable boiler load, based on furnace liberation, is 81% for PC firing and 78% for CWF firing; there is no deration based on plan area heat release requirements.

As before, a higher unit deration, due to allowable flue gas velocities, is obtained when firing the high ash fuels. This is again due to the requirement for erosion barriers to offset the erosion potential of high ash fuel.

7.4 Small Pendant Panel Design - Cont'd.

The following maximum attainable loads were calculated:

Fuel		Fuel Gas Velocity Limited Max. Attainable Boiler Load
High Ash	PC	75%
Low Ash	PC	87%
High Ash	CWF	71%
Low Ash	CWF	83%

The flue gas temperature entering the horizontal primary superheater bank limits the maximum attainable load to 51% on PC firing and 51% on CWF firing.

FIGURE 7.9 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN
MAX. ATTAINABLE LOAD
VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR HASH R.C. FIRING





FIGURE 7.10 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN MAX. ATTAINABLE LOAD VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR LASH P.C. FIRING

LEGEND

PAH RR ~ PLAN AREA HEAT RELEASE RATE

FEGT ~ FURNACE EXIT GAS TEMPERATURE

46 1323
K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO MADE IN U.S.A.



FIGURE 7.11 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN MAX. ATTAINABLE LOAD VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR HASH CWF FIRING

46 1323
K·E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 3 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.



FIGURE 7.12 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN MAX. ATTAINABLE LOAD VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR LASH CWF FIRING

46 1323
K-E 10 X 10 TO H INCH 7 X 10 INCHES KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

7.5 Large Pendant Panel Design

Figures 7.13 to 7.16 illustrate the maximum attainable boiler load for PC and CWF firing for the oil-designed large Pendant Panel.

The following maximum attainable loads are a result of the increased slagging potential of PC and CWF.

Fuel	PAHRR	Maximum Attainable Load Furnace Liberation
High Ash PC	97%	76%
Low Ash PC	97%	76%
High Ash CWF	94%	74%
Low Ash CWF	94%	74%

The furnace exit gas temperature limitation results in a maximum attainable boiler load of 57% PC firing and 55% on CWF firing.

7.5 Large Pendant Panel Design - Cont'd.

The tight side spacing of the reheater outlet bank results in severe limitation of boiler load. In order to keep the flue gas temperature at acceptable levels the maximum attainable load is 42% on PC firing and one CWF firing.

As before, the need for erosion barriers for high ash fuel firing leads to higher unit deration than for low ash fuel firing.

The following boiler loads are attainable based on flue gas velocity limitations.

Fuel	Flue Gas Limited Max. Attainable Boiler Loads
High Ash PC	47%
Low Ash PC	62%
High Ash CWF	45%
Low Ash CWF	53%

FIGURE 7.13 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN
MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS
PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR HIGH ASH P.C. FIRING



FIGURE 7.14 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN
MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS
PERFORMANCE LIMITS
FOR - LOW ASH P.C. FIRING



46 1323
K&E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO.

FIGURE 7.15 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR HIGH ASH CWF FIRING



46 1323
K+E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO

46 1323
K+E 10 X 10 TO ½ INCH 7 X 10 INCHES
KEUFFEL & ESSER CO. MADE IN U.S.A.

FIGURE 7.16 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN MAX ATTAINABLE LOAD VS PERFORMANCE LIMITS FOR LOW ASH CWF FIRING



8.0 Auxiliary Equipment Consideration

Converting an oil designed unit to fire PC or CWF will impact the selection and operation of equipment such as fans, regenerative airheaters and sootblowers. Firing PC fuel presents special problems. Sufficient room must be available for pulverizers, primary air fans and coal pipes. The total air necessary for combustion of the PC fuel must be divided into primary and secondary air flows. The primary air quantity is extracted from the total air flow at the regenerative airheater exit and passed through pulverizers by 'hot' primary air fans. This primary air is used to dry and transport the pulverized coal particles to the furnace. This obviously results in substantial additions of ductwork to connect this new primary air system to the boiler. Additional fans to supply seal air for the pulverizers are also required.

As the intent of this study is to evaluate the conversion potential of oil-designed units to coal/water slurry fuel, the bulk of the investigation will be centered around the impact on the auxiliary equipment associated with firing coal/water slurry.

8.1 Small Oil Fired Boiler Designs

These units normally have one forced draft fan,

8.1 Small Oil Fired Boiler Designs (cont'd)

one steam coil airheater and one regenerative air preheater. They operate with a pressurized furnace and do not utilize ID fans. However, for CWF firing, pressurized operation is not generally practised due to the presence of ash fines which create a need for an induced draft fan for balanced draft operation and impact the operating duty of the forced draft fan.

8.1.1 Forced Draft Fan

The following table shows the fan selection criteria for oil firing:

	Net Operating Load	Test Block
Capacity (lb/hr)	689,000	826,000
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	80	105
Static Pressure (in Wg)	20	25

Firing the units with coal/water slurry would result in the following operating fan duties: (assuming an ID fan has been added to the unit)

	Boiler Load		
	100%	35%	51%
Capacity (lb/hr)	795,000	303,000	396,000
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	80	80	80
Static Pressure (in Wg)	11	6	7

8.1.1 Forced Draft Fan (cont'd)

As can be seen from these duties, if the boiler were capable of full load on CWF firing, which is however not the case, the fans would be operating very close to their test block capacity. The FEGT - limited load of 35% for the small Box Type unit results in a fan duty well within the capabilities of the fan, however, the turndown available will be severely limited.

The 51% maximum attainable load on CWF firing for the small Pendant Panel unit is governed by side spacing vs gas temperature. As can be seen this duty is well within the capabilities of the fan. Operating the fans at well below their design capability could result in some fan instability problems. A detailed investigation of the fan's operating characteristics would be necessary to ensure it could operate acceptably under these conditions.

8.1.2 Regenerative Air Preheaters

The regenerative air preheaters were selected based on the following full load duty on oil firing:

	100% load - Oil Fired
Gas weight to AH (lb/hr)	705,950
Air weight lvg AH (lb/hr)	643,850
Gas temp. to AH (deg. F)	737
Gas temp. lvg AH (deg F) (uncorrected for leakage)	300
Air temp. to AH (deg. F)	80
Air temp. lvg AH (deg. F)	605

Coal/water firing would result in the following airheater performance:

	Boiler Load		
	100%	35%	51%
Gas weight to AH (lb/hr)	848,820	307,000	424,000
Air weight lvg AH (lb/hr)	749,470	283,000	380,000
Gas temp. to AH (deg. F)	764	595	642
Gas temp. lvg AH (deg. F) (uncorrected for leakage)	322	270	230
Air temp. to AH (deg. F)	80	115 (SCAH on)	93
Air temp. lvg AH (deg. F)	630	514	524

8.1.2 Regenerative Air Preheaters (cont'd)

As can be seen from this performance, the regenerative airheater has more surface than necessary for CWF firing. The FEGT limited load of 35% on CWF firing for the small Box Type design produces an air exit temperature of 514 deg. F and the need for steam coil air preheating for cold end corrosion protection. The 51% CWF fired load for the small Pendant Panel results in an air exit temperature of 524 deg. F and the need for steam coil air preheating. Although this is not the optimum situation this performance is acceptable.

8.1.3 Sootblowers

When firing PC or CWF in the oil designed boilers, more sootblowers will be required due to the increased ash content of the fuel. This ash leads to slagging in the furnace and fouling of the convective surfaces in the boiler. The following summarizes the typical quantity of additional sootblowers needed for the Box Type and Pendant Panel boiler styles in this size range: (Ref. Fig. 8.1 - 8.4)

	Box Type		Pendant Panel	
Sootblower Type	Oil	CWF	Oil	CWF
Retractable	16	22	14	24
Wallblower	-	8	-	8
Arch Wallblower	-	2	-	2

8.2 Large Boiler Designs

The large boiler designs selected incorporate balanced draft firing and consequently do not require fans to induce draft. This may not be the case on all existing boilers. The large units have two forced draft fans, two induced draft fans, two regenerative air preheaters and two steam coil air preheaters.

8.2.1 Forced Draft Fans

The following table shows the forced draft fan selection criteria for full load oil firing:

	Net Operating Load	Test Block
Capacity (lb/hr/fan)	709,000	851,000
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	80	105
Static Pressure (in Wg)	13	16.25

Firing the large units with high ash coal/water slurry results in a furnace exit gas temperature limited maximum load of 55% for the Box style unit and a gas temperature vs side spacing limited maximum load of 42% for the Pendant Panel style. The following operating fan duties would result:

8.2.1 Forced Draft Fans (cont'd)

	Boiler Load		
	100%	55%	42%
Capacity (lb/hr/fan)	795,000	490,400	392,400
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	80	87	96
Static Pressure (in Wg)	15	9.0	8.0

As can be seen, these operating loads would pose no problems for these fans. The option of using only one forced draft fan at low loads instead of two provides extra turndown capability.

8.2.2 Induced Draft Fans

The following table shows the induced draft fan selection criteria for full load oil firing:

	Net Operating Load	Test Block
Capacity (lb/hr/fan)	773,000	912,000
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	343	368
Static Pressure (in Wg)	20.0	25.0

Firing high ash coal/water slurry in the large units would result in the following operating fan duties:

	Boiler Load		
	100%	55%	42%
Capacity (lb/hr/fan)	923,700	541,600	425,000
Fluid Temp. (deg. F)	349	312	300
Static Pressure (in Wg)	29.0	9.0	7.0

8.2.2 Induced Draft Fans - (cont'd.)

As illustrated above, the oil-designed induced draft fans are incapable of full load on CWF firing. The possibility of fan instability is definitely present for the Pendant Panel maximum load of 42%. A detailed investigation of the fan operating characteristics would be necessary during a site-specific conversion feasibility study.

8.2.3 Regenerative Air Preheaters

The regenerative air preheaters were selected based on the following full load duty on oil firing:

	100% load - Oil Fired
Gas weight to AH (lb/hr each)	725,515
Air weight lvg AH (lb/hr each)	661,695
Gas temp. to AH (deg. F)	671
Gas temp. lvg AH (deg. F) (uncorrected for leakage)	360
Air temp. to AH (deg. F)	80
Air temp. lvg AH (deg. F)	457

8.2.3 Regenerative Air Preheaters (cont'd)

Firing coal/water slurry would result in the following airheater performance:

	Boiler Load		
	100%	55%	42%
Gas weight to AH (lb/hr ea)	875,885	495,000	385,000
Air weight lvg AH (lb/hr ea)	821,207	443,000	352,000
Gas temp. to AH (deg. F)	660	620	600
Gas temp. lvg AH (deg. F) (uncorrected for leakage)	364	332	322
Air temp. to AH (deg. F)	80	87	96
Air temp. lvg AH (deg. F)	451	440	430

These regenerative airheaters provide marginal performance. The secondary air temperatures may not be high enough to support stable combustion on CWF firing. Some preheat of secondary air by steam coils may be necessary.

8.2.4 Sootblowers

As with the small units, firing PC or CWF in the oil designed boilers will require more sootblowers to ensure the unit remains clean. The following summarizes the typical quantity of additional sootblowers needed for the Box Type & Pendant Panel boiler styles in this size range:

	Box Type		Pendant Panel	
Sootblower Type	Oil	CWF	Oil	CWF
Retractable	24	36	22	32
Wallblower	-	8	-	8
Arch Wallblower	-	2	-	2

Ref. Fig. 8.5 - 8.8

FIG. 4.1 SMALL BOX TYPE DESIGN



Figure 8.1 Sootblower for Oil Fired Small Box Type Design



• Retractable Sootblower (One in each sidewall)

FIG. 4.1 SMALL BOX TYPE DESIGN



Figure: 8.2 Sootblower for Coal Fired Small Box Type Design



- Retractable sootblower (one in each sidewall)
- Wallblower (One in each wall)
- Arch wall blower (one in each sidewall)

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND IS LOANED UPON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS OR UNLESS RETURNED UPON REQUEST

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.
EQUIPMENT 700 MLB/HR COAL FIRED RAD AN'L BOX TYPE B
CUSTOMER DSSC COAL/MAJOR FUEL - OPERATING STUDY
SCALE

Figure: 8.3 Sooblowers
for Oil-Fired Small
Pendant Panel Design

FIG. 4.3 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN



SECTION "A-A"



SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

•Retractable sootblower
(one in each sidewall)

3'-0"

-100-

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA (BABCOCK & WILCOX INDUSTRIES LTD.) AND IS LOANED UPON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS, OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA, AND IS TO BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST
DO NOT SCALE - USE DIMENSIONS ONLY

REV.	PARTICULARS	LOC'N	DATE	CH'K

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 700 MLB/HR CORNER FIRED RAD PEND PANEL BLR
INDEXED D.S.S.C. OPERATING STUDY BY
DRAWN TH TR. FIRST ORDER 693-7470
SCALE ~ DATE APRIL 15/83 DR. 300252 REV. 0 APP.

o. 300252

Figure: 8.4 Sootblowers
For Coal Fired Small
Pendant Panel Design

FIG. 4.3 SMALL PENDANT PANEL DESIGN



SECTION "A-A"



SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

• retractable sootblower (one in each sidewall)

● Wallblower (one in each wall)

▲ Arch Wallblower (one in each sidewall)

3'-0"

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA (BABCOCK & WILCOX INDUSTRIES LTD) AND IS LOANED UPON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR FURNISHING INFORMATION TO OTHERS OR FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA AND IS TO BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST
DO NOT SCALE - USE DIMENSIONS ONLY

REV.	PARTICULARS	LOC'N	DATE	CH'K

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 700 MLB/HR CORNER FIRED RAD PEND PANEL BLR

INDICATED DSSC OPERATING STUDY BY

DRAWN TF TR. CH'K FIRST ORDER 693-7470

SCALE ~ DATE APRIL 15/83 NO. 300252 REV. 0 APP. J

p. 300252

FIG. 4.2 LARGE BOX TYPE DESIGN



Figure 8.5
Sootblower for Oil Fired Large Box Type Design



FIG. 4.2 LARGE BOX TYPE DESIGN



Figure: 8.6 Sootblower for Coal Fired Large Box Type Design



- Retractable sootblower (one in each sidewall)
- Wall Blower (One in each wall)
- Arch wallblwoer (one in each sidewall)

FIG 4.8 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN



Figure 8.7 Sootblower for oil fired large design pendant panel



•retractable sootblower (one in each sidewall)

SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

EQUIPMENT 200 M/W 'CORNER FRED' RADIANT PENDANT PANEL ELE

CUSTOMER D.S.S. - DESIGNING STUDY

DRAWN PTDS CHK APP

SCALE 1:12 DATE NO

3012249 01

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND IS LOANED ON CONDITION THAT IT IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR COPIED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR USED FOR PURPOSES DETRIMENTAL TO THE INTERESTS OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD AND WILL BE RETURNED UPON REQUEST

REV. DESCRIPTION

FIG. 4.4 LARGE PENDANT PANEL DESIGN



Figure 8.8 Sootblower for coal fired large Pendant Panel



SIDE SECTIONAL ELEVATION

- Retractable sootblower (one in each sidewall)
- Wallblower (one in each Wall)
- Arch wallblower (one in each sidewall)

9.0 Modifications to Reduce Derations

9.1 General

Unit modifications can be made to reduce the derating effects of firing CWF in an oil designed boiler. However, consideration should be given to limit these modifications to changes that will not seriously degrade the unit's capability on oil firing.

A major concern when firing CWF is to limit the flue gas temperature entering the convective heat transfer surface to below the ash fusion temperature. The obvious method to accomplish this is to limit the heat input to the furnace (i.e. derate the boiler). In some cases, however, it is not economically feasible to operate the unit at these reduced loads.

One method available to reduce this furnace exit gas temperature (FEGT) is burner tilts. With this technique the fireball is shifted downward in the furnace causing increased furnace absorption and reduced furnace exit temperature. A detailed site specific investigation would have to be performed to assess the impact of burner tilts on the unit and its auxiliaries.

9.1 General (cont'd.)

Another method to reduce the FEGT is to place more heating surface in the furnace. One way this can be accomplished is by using watercooled wingwalls located in the upper furnace. This modification would require a detailed study of the boiler circulation system to ensure natural circulation is maintained and cyclone steam separators are not overloaded. Additional feeders and risers would be required to supply water to the wingwall and return it to the drum. It must be stressed that this technique requires a detailed study.

If the load-limiting performance criteria is flue gas velocity or gas temperature vs side spacing, the tube spacing can be altered by removing alternate tube rows or replacing entire banks of tubes.

9.2 Small Box Type Design

The maximum attainable load on CWF firing for this unit is determined by the allowable FEGT at the tightly spaced (9") furnace exit. If the spacing of this superheat bank could be increased to 18" (perpendicular to the gas flow) the unit could be operated at 54% for high ash CWF firing and 63% for low ash CWF firing. This is a result of the maximum attainable boiler load now being limited by allowable flue gas velocity and allowable furnace heat liberation rate respectively. Additional superheat surface would probably have to be added elsewhere in the boiler to provide sufficient heat absorption to make superheater exit temperature.

9.3 Large Box Type Design

For high ash CWF firing, the gas free flow area entering the primary superheater bank at the top of the downpass limits the maximum attainable boiler load to 55%. If pressure part changes could be made to increase the free flow area, and thereby reduce the gas velocity entering this bank the unit load could be increased.

This unit might be a candidate for more unique solutions to reduce the FEGT; such as watercooled wing-

9.3 Large Box Type Design (cont'd.)

walls located in the upper furnace. This would require detailed circulation calculations to establish tube arrangement.

9.4 Small Pendant Panel Design

The tube side spacing of the primary superheater bank at the top of the downpass limits the maximum attainable boiler load during CWF firing. This 4" spacing could be increased to permit the boiler to be fired at a higher load. Increasing the side spacing of this bank would also eliminate the limitation due to flue gas velocity. The maximum boiler load cannot be increased above 70% for CWF firing due to furnace exit gas temperature limitations.

9.5 Large Pendant Panel Design

This unit is particularly suitable for pressure part modifications due to the severe load deration resulting from the tight side spacing of the first reheat bank. Removing every other row of the reheater bank may allow the unit load to be increased to the FEGT - limited load of 55% for CWF firing. This will, of course, result in the required addition of reheat surface in some other area.

10.0 Discussion of Results

10.1 Boiler

The maximum attainable boiler loads for each boiler model for PC and CWF firing are summarized in Figures 10.1 to 10.4. The major boiler load limiting parameters were furnace exit gas temperature, flue gas velocity and flue gas temperature vs tube side spacing.

When considering Figure 10.1 it is noted that the Small Box Type design is the most severely derated boiler with its maximum attainable load of 35% for CWF firing and 36% for PC firing. This is a reflection of the fact that the Box design standards are primarily for oil and gas fired units. This results in a 'tighter' furnace size and consequently lower furnace residence times and higher furnace exit gas temperatures.

The large Pendent- Panel model was also severely derated with maximum attainable boiler loads of 42% for CWF and PC firing. This severe deration is a result of tight tube side spacing at the entrance to the first reheater bank.

10.1 Boiler - (cont'd.)

Although this model appears to be heavily derated it is probably the unit style and size that could most benefit from modifications. "Opening up" the tube spacing at this bank could substantially increase the attainable boiler load for CWF and PC firing. The fact that the Pendant Panel boiler designs are generated for primarily solid fuels results in the potential for big gains in attainable loads from unit modifications.

The large Box Style model is load limited by allowable furnace exit gas temperature to:

55% for low ash CWF

55% for high ash CWF

57% for low ash PC

57% for high ash PC

The unit cannot be fired above these limited loads without major pressure part changes to increase the heat absorbing surface in the furnace.

The small Pendant Panel model is capable of attainable 51% load for CWF firing and 51% load for PC firing. Its maximum load is limited by flue gas temperature vs tube side spacing criteria at the first downpass primary superheater bank. "Opening up" the spacing of this bank would permit this unit to be fired at 70% load for CWF firing.

10.1 Boiler - (cont'd.)

This model design is particularly conservative because Pendant Panel designs are intended solid fuel boilers of larger sizes. This results in a larger than necessary furnace for oil firing, due to physical design limits, and consequently less deration during PC or CWF firing. The design FEGT on oil for this unit is 180 deg. F lower than for the small Box Type unit due to the physical furnace requirements.

10.2 Performance

In cases where the maximum attainable boiler load when firing PC or CWF is below the boiler control range, deviations in the steam conditions resulted. For example, for the large Pendant Panel Design 42% maximum load on high ash CWF firing the following steam conditions result:

Superheater Steam Flow	- 464,000 lb/hr
Superheater Steam Exit Temp.	- 897 deg. F
Reheater Steam Flow	- 410,000 lb/hr
Reheater Steam Exit Temp.	- 880 deg. F

10.2 Performance - (cont'd.)

For boiler loads within the control range satisfactory steam temperatures were obtained for all units with reasonable amounts of attemperator spray. If pressure part changes are made to reduce a units' deration for CWF firing, care must be taken to ensure against excessive spray quantities. An additional concern when making pressure part changes is the effect these changes will have upon the boilers ability to fire oil.

The additional moisture present in CWF resulted in lower boiler efficiencies. This is of course due to the need to evaporate this additional moisture in the fuel.

This decrease in unit efficiency results in firing more fuel for the same heat output. This results in a small increase in flue gas weight at any given load. The small additional deration to go from PC to CWF firing is a result of this drop in unit efficiency.

10.2 Performance - (cont'd.)

Research work done by Babcock & Wilcox on firing CWF in various burners under various conditions led to some correlations between excess air levels, volatile matter in fuels and secondary air temperatures. Based upon this experience, the minimum secondary air temperature that could support stable combustion for this specific CWF is estimated to be in the neighbourhood of 500 deg.F. This limitation may result in the need for some form of additional air preheat (i.e. larger steam coil air heaters, duct burners, etc.).

Firing PC or CWF will result in higher NO_x production than firing oil. This is primarily due to the large increase in fuel NO_x due to the large increase in nitrogen content of the PC and CWF.

The NO_x formed during CWF firing will be somewhat lower than for PC firing due to the reduction in adiabatic flame temperature. This lower flame temperature will result in a reduction in the formation of the temperature dependent thermal NO_x.


% MCR ATTAINABLE
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
55%
LARGE BOX TYPE LASH CWF FEGT
LARGE BOX TYPE HASH CWF FEGT
57%
LARGE BOX TYPE LASH PC FEGT
LARGE BOX TYPE HASH PC FEGT
42%
LARGE PEND. PLATEN LASH CWF GAS TEMP VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN HASH CWF GAS TEMP VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN LASH PC GAS TEMP. VS. SPCG.
LARGE PEND. PLATEN HASH PC GAS TEMP. VS. SPCG.
35%
SMALL BOX TYPE LASH CWF FEGT
SMALL BOX TYPE HASH CWF FEGT
36%
SMALL BOX TYPE LASH PC FEGT
SMALL BOX TYPE HASH PC FEGT
51%
SMALL PEND. PLATEN LASH CWF GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN HASH CWF GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN LASH PC GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.
SMALL PEND. PLATEN HASH PC GAS TEMP. VS SPCG.

FIGURE 10.1 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOADS VS MAJOR DERATING VARIABLE FIRING P-C & C.W.F.

LASH = LOW HASH
HASH = HIGH ASH



FIGURE 10.2 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS. GAS VELOCITY FIRING P.C & C WF



FIGURE 10.3 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS FEGT FIRING P.C & C.W.F



FIGURE 10.4 MAXIMUM ATTAINABLE BOILER LOAD VS GAS TEMP/SIDE SPACING FIRING PC & CWF

11.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Electric Power Research Institute, Coal-Oil Mixture as a Utility Boiler Fuel, Research Project 1455-2, March 1982.

2. Electric Power Research Institute, Coal-Water Slurry as a Utility Boiler Fuel, Research Projects 1180-12, 1895-1, Match 1982.

3. Ehrlich's., Coal Use in Boilers Designed For Oil and Gas Firing, Volume 42, Proceedings of the American Power Conference, 1980.

4. Electric Power Research Institute, Combustion Tests of Coal-Water Slurry, Research Project 1895-2, prepared by Babcock & Wilcox Company, Alliance, Ohio, March 1982.

5. M. Mathiesen, AB Carbogel, letter to Dr. H. Whaley, CANMET, December 14, 1982.

6. Borio, R.W. and Hargrove, M.J., The Effects of Coal Slurry Fuels on Steam Generators, presented at Coal Technology '82, December 9, 1982, Houston, Texas.

7. Manfred, R.K., Coal-Water Slurry as an Alternate Fuel, presented at Coal Technology '82, Dec. 9, 1982, Houston, Texas.

8. Donnelly, R.G., Formulation, Handling & Combustion Characteristics of Coal-Water Mixtures, presented at Coal Technology '82 Dec, 1982, Houston, Texas.

9. Kulig, J.S., Northport Power Station Boiler Evaluation CWS, Prepared by Babcock & Wilcox Company, Fossil Power Generation Division, June 15, 1982.

10. Furman, R.C., Power Plant Conversions to Coal, Coal-Oil Mixtures and Coal-Water Slurries, 4th International Symposium on Coal Slurry Combustion, May 10, 1982, Orlando, Florida.

11. Whaley, H., Canadian Initiatives in Coal-Liquid Mixture Combustion and Development, Canadian Combustion Research Laboratory, Jan.1982.

12. Sommer, I.M. et al, Development of a High Solids, Coal Water Mixture for Applications as a Boiler Fuel, presented at Coal: Phoenix of the 80's, June 1981. Babcock & Wilcox Company technical paper BR-1203.

13. Glenn, R.D. and Rodes, A.W., Coal/Water Slurry Systems for Oil-Designed Power Plants, Research Project 1180-4 Final Report, the Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, California, September 1979.

POOR

QUALITY

ORIGINAL